

Bomhard, Weaknesses of Nostratic Theory and Very Intense Turkish at the Roots of “Indo-European”

Kaan Arslanoğlu

08 June 2022

SUMMARY

The Indo-European theory is the theory of the colonialist-racist side of Europe. It represents the dark period in science. Nostratic theory represents enlightenment. But if the measure of success is to get the majority of academia to accept its point of view, it has failed. The Nostratic movement was not successful because it adhered to the basic scientific method. Because while the majority confronting Nostraticists is shouting a so-called science with a loud noise, they actually behave like cult followers. Indo-European is a religion, a belief. Of course, most of the linguists of I-E side are not aware of their racist attitude, they even believe that they are doing science with the most humanistic feelings and in good faith. The problem is rather political, ideological and psychological, not scientificity. This is the main problem in social sciences, in fact, this is the main issue in all branches of science. In this article, I will first examine two major weaknesses of the Nostratic Theory. Then I will summarize the views that indicate how strong and intense Turkish is in the Western languages. In so called I-E languages. Then I will illustrate and prove all this through two studies of **Allan R. Bomhard** and one by **Kassian** and his colleagues.

NOSTRATIC THEORY

George Telezhko, who participated in the discussion of my last article which I published here, and with whom we think close things about some problems of linguistics, showed an article and asked my opinion about this view. That article

belonged to **Alexander Kozintsev** (1). In accordance with the Nostratic Theory, he revealed that the Indo-European languages were related to the Uralic and Altaic languages, and therefore there were strong ties between them. He argued that, of all other languages, the Semitic languages were the closest group to these related languages. In my answer, I said that I am close to this view. And now it's time to say something about Nostratic theory and other questions.

Pedersen, author of the 1903 article "*Türkische Lautgesetze*" ... **Vladislav Illic-Svitič, Vladimir Dibo, Aron Dolgopolski, Sergey Starostin**... Their theory is the result of an environment away from racism and the objective scientific method becoming dominant again. **Allan R. Bomhard**, with his original opinions, is currently the strongest advocate of this point of view in linguistics.

Soviet linguists were undoubtedly aware of the ideological, political side of the problem that I briefly mentioned in the summary. But in this regard, they were neither developed enough nor the environment they were in was so free. The problem of nations, especially the problem of Turkishness, was one of the most sensitive and weak points of the Soviet Union. Therefore, the issue could not be discussed with its ideological and national dimensions. The theory could not develop itself in this direction. Therefore, firm positions could not be gained against the Indo-European majority, which attacked almost exclusively with ideological means. Although the Nostratic Theory is much more scientific than I-E, this pseudo-science of IE cannot be got rid of by staying only in the scientific field. The issue is a political issue before being scientific. Because the science in this field is directly governed by politics. Beliefs and policy govern the views, scholarly work and the views of linguists and their followers. Therefore,

one must be firm in showing scientific evidence and producing a scientific thesis. But it should be known that this will definitely not be enough.

The second major dilemma is about the approach to Turkish. Proponents of the Nostratic Theory try to extend the narrow family of Indo-European monopoly by saying that many languages come from common roots belonging to a bigger language family. They are largely right. In doing so, they add Altaic languages to this extended macro family. Without saying too much about Turkish. Because it's unfavorable. Turkish is considered an ordinary member of the Altaic language family. It is not even clear whether it is related to the Uralic languages. Altaic language family is nonsense, or rather all these language families are nonsense, mostly to hide something. To obscure a fundamental truth. To underestimate the dominant importance of Turkish. Of course all languages are important, all languages are respectable. But if you consider some languages spoken by only a few million people only in a certain field to be more important than Turkish... For the sake of linguistics... If you put some lost languages spoken by a few hundred thousand people far ahead of Turkish in linguistics... This is another racist thing what you do. The advocates of the Nostratic Theory did not do this for racist purposes, they even thought that they gave great importance to Turkish. But racism, and especially hostility towards Turks is so widespread in the World. The IE theory is so offensive at this point... The advocates of the Nostratic Theory chose a shy way of fighting against IE. They thought they had done their duty by giving the Turkish a third-degree role in this great family theater. However, it was already one of the indispensable leading actors in that game.

Turkish was once a more widely spoken language than today's English, although much more native regarding the use of today's English for

international communication purposes. Thousands of years ago, itself or its roots left strong marks on many languages, from South America and North America to the westernmost tip of Europe and the Middle East and Anatolia. With more than 42 dialects of it, with nearly 100 states established on three continents. It is a language spoken by almost all genetic groups in the world except for a few. In other words not limited to one or a few haplogroups. These traces on the languages of the world can still be seen clearly. It is not possible to do science in linguistics by denying this fact.

OPINIONS REVEALING THE ROOT EFFECT OF TURKISH

Norm Kisamov claims that fifty percent of the most used words in daily speech in languages spoken in Europe today have Turkish roots. Kisamov is against the concept of "proto" in linguistics. Because he says that it is not possible to show how, where, and through what stages a language passed from the "proto" to the original language. Therefore, to say "proto" is meaningless. Languages tend to mix, change and renew with each other since their first emergence. This is a natural process. All languages are mixtures, amalgams. Turkish also is an amalgam that started to form tens of thousands of years ago. Instead of the concept of language families, he prefers to use the German concept "Sprachbund": Language unions. At the end of this article, I put a long quote from Kisamov about the morphology of Turkish. Morphology contains important reminders to Nostratic theorists and other linguists who are meticulous about sound changes.

Anatole Klyosov argues that three thousand years ago, the majority of European peoples spoke the Arbin language (Proto-Turkish) (2). The only exception was the Celts, but later they were also highly influenced by Proto-Turkish. Those who speak Proto-Turkish are those who carry the R1b gene.

Klyosov develops these views based on genetic findings. According to him, the major focus representing the R1a Indo-European language in Europe is the Slavs. Author **Bill Lipton** commented to our article on Klyosov, where he supported these findings.

M. F. Kurmaev showed the Turkic roots of the Sumerians in an extensive article (3). **Fritz Hommel** and **Noah Kramer** had previously put forward similar views on this issue. In these pages, author **Frans Bronkhorst** stated: *"Kaan Arslanoğlu's article is another nail in the coffin of the outerspatians, said in some quarters to have come from out there to bring civilization to earth in the Mesopotamian flatlands.*

Reading the author's linguistic comparisons between the Sumerian and Turkish languages, it becomes clear that the Sumerians must have been the Mesopotamian offshoot of the Turkish speaking peoples."

One of those who talk about the Turkic roots of the Etruscans is **Mario Alinei** in his book *"Etruscan: an archaic form of Hungarian"*.

Author **Anton Perdih** also said in these pages: *"Do not evade taking into account that the Altaic speaking Y chromosome haplogroup R1b people intruded the Eastern and parts of Central and South Europe several times until about 6,000 years ago. Then they advanced south to Mesopotamia, Egypt, Central Africa. And across the North Africa about 4,800 years ago to Western Europe. Then they conquered the western and parts of the central and northern Europe, where their descendants are now the major part of the male population and were the bearers of most "Western" actions.*

So, from the above point of view is looking for Turkish-like words in "Western" languages an appropriate action. What will be the result, that's another question."

Linguist **Xavier Rouard** continues to write solid articles for revision of Indo-European theory. He shows the root relationships of Indo-European with a Eurasian macro family, including Turkish. (4)

Linguist **Mel Copeland** does not accept that Turkish is a founding language, but writes in his studies that it shows important commonalities with Indo-European languages (5).

Linguist **Gabra Agziaabhir JR.** unquestionably accepts Turkish as one of the languages belonging to Indo-Germanic group.

Author **Panagiotis L. Kampouris** wrote: *"Clearly the Hittite language is also related to Turkish."*

In the discussions here, academics such as Sirkka Maki, Joseph Biddulp, Mathew Steenburg, Israel Palchan, Johan Coetser, Wladimir Pajevic, Jadranka Ahlgren, Emilio Ramirez Juidias, Ifeany Nwokoro, Peter D. DunphyHetherington, Keith Armstrong, Wolodymyr H. Kozyrski, Georgeos Diaz Montexano gave the opinion in this framework, have expressed their support. Likewise, academics such as Dominique Maruitte and Wim J. Borsboom expressed their interest.

Another writer, **Yuri Nikolayevich Drozdov**, describes Turkish in ancient Europe (6):

"All ancient and most early medieval written sources concerned with European history exist in one of two languages: Ancient Greek or Latin. Neither one was

much used in ancient times on the European land mass as vernacular, and after Late Antiquity they effectively fell into complete desuetude.

According to relevant historical written records, compiled in the period between Antiquity and the Early Mediaeval period, on the European land mass were more than 2,500 names of tribes and peoples. None of these names are derived from Ancient Greek or from Latin, but from some other European languages.

(...) What were these languages? Who spoke them? What is the relationship of their speakers to today's European peoples? How and why did their languages change to those we hear today? The earliest European ethnonym to be found on the pages of ancient written sources is that of the Cimmerians. A semantic and etymological analysis of this word shows that it has been of typical Türkic tribal nomenclature. Ancient sources provide detailed information that the Cimmerians belonged to the Scythian people who were later called the Huns. (...)

Modern opinion holds that the Scythians inhabited a vast territory stretching from the Urals to Vistula. Other names for them were Sarmatians or Savromatians. Analysis of their tribal ethnic names shows that they all were Türkic-speaking; indeed the works of numerous contemporary scholars and specialists demonstrate convincingly that the Scythians were a Türkic-speaking people, and this is directly confirmed by the Western European Middle Ages documentary evidence of the written records. And in anthropological terms the Scythians were predominantly of the Caucasoid type. The original location of the Scythian tribes in Europe, including Huns, Avars, Bulgars and others, was the Middle Volga and Kama river basins, where they probably appeared no later than the third millenium BC. Some of these tribes subsequently settled in the wide expanse of land between the Volga and Don, an area they began

calling Asia. At some point, apparently around the end of the third millenium BC, the Middle Volga tribes migrated to Central, Southern and Northern Europe, passing as they went through the Upper Volga basin and the lands around Baltic Sea. In all probability these tribes were carriers of the so-called Battle-Axe Culture (Also known as Corded Ware Culture and Single Grave Culture, names reflecting different aspects of the archeological record in artefacts and burial customs). At a later date these Türkic-speaking peoples from Middle Volga and Kama basins also began migration, via the banks of the Sea of Azov and Black Sea, to Southern, Central and Northern Europe. Apparently, from earliest antiquity the dominant peoples in Europe stemmed from the Türkic-speaking tribes.”

In this article I cited, Drozdov did not mention the southern branch of Turkish and its influence on European languages through Greek and Latin, but we did it in our works.

NOSTRATIC-INDO'EUROPEAN-TURKISH HARMONY FROM BOMHARD'S TWO WORKS (7,8)

Bomhard is one of the greatest masters of the field. Compared to him, my knowledge is modest. But my advantage is to look at the subject from outside, from a bird's eye view, to evaluate the phenomenon objectively better than all these linguists, together with the philosophical, political, historical and conceptual aspects of the subject. Bomhard pays great attention to morphology, the laws of sound change, and the rules for how roots and words are transferred. He explains many things, reveals new inventions. However, he cannot be as good as us at seeing the obvious Turkish in the roots and knowing the rules of transition and change of Turkic roots. For example, most Turkic

roots take an 's' when they move to the west. The initial 't' and 'l' changes. Some roots that begin with 'o-ö' in Turkish lose these vowels. 'Ad-da' changes... etc. I don't know all of these either, there are some people who know better than me. And as far as I know, I'm showing the simplest overlaps here. I reviewed the first 50 items from each of Bomhard's two studies. 100 in total. You will see very obvious and intense commonalities. But even though Bomhard catches a bird with his mouth (a Turkish saying) - he already does so in his works - it is of no value. He can't beat the faith-based pseudoscience of the IE monks.

Source (reference) 7

My notes are orange, Turkish ones are red

1- *baHʌ 'to tie to': Kartvelian *b- 'to tie to, to hang' ~ Altaic ***bā**- 'to tie to'. Strong.

Bomhard reconstructs the following Proto-Nostratic forms based upon evidence from Afrasian, Kartvelian, and Altaic: Proto-Nostratic root *baɣ- (~ *bəɣ-): (vb.) *baɣ- 'to tie, to bind; to attach, to fasten'; (n.) *baɣ-a 'tie, bond, bandage, fastening'

Bond, bandage, bag, ban (prohibit) > **bağ** (bandage, knot); **bağlama** (tie), **ban** (bond, prevent it going away), **bohça** (bag) / **men** (Arabic, Turkish): **ban**

2- *baḲa 'to look': Hamito-Semitic *bq- 'to look' ~ Altaic ***baka**- 'to look'.

Strong. Comments: a) The meaning in Afrasian is more 'to look at, to look over, to examine'. b) Starostin—Dybo—Mudrak (2003:323) reconstruct Proto-Altaic *băka 'to look, to watch'. c) Not in Bomhard (2021) (?)

Look > **bak** (?)

3- *balɿ/u/ 'to swallow': Hamito-Semitic *blɿ 'to swallow' ~ Altaic ***balgu-** /***bilgu** 'to swallow; throat'. Strong. Proto-Nostratic root *bal- (~ *bəl-)

(?) I have not verified yet the Altaic root in Turkish.

4- *balga 'to flash, to sparkle': Hamito-Semitic *brq 'flash, lightning' ~ Kartvelian *bercq- 'to flash, to sparkle' ~ Indo-European *bhelg-/ *bhleg- 'to flash, to sparkle' ~ Altaic [***balka-** 'to shine, to sparkle']. Rejected.

Comment: a) This etymology cannot stand as written and, therefore, must be disqualified. Illič-Svityč has confused two separate, unrelated Proto-Nostratic stems here. Each is a solid Nostratic etymology in its own right, but they do not belong together. b) 2. There is no basis whatsoever for reconstructing Proto-Nostratic */g/, even within the context of the evidence supplied by Illič-Svityč. This violates Illič-Svityč's own sound correspondences: Proto-Afrasian */q/ does not correspond to Proto-Kartvelian */c/ nor to Proto-Indo-European */g/. Bomhard reconstructs the following Proto-Nostratic forms for the first etymology based upon evidence from Afrasian, Dravidian, Indo-European, and Altaic: Proto-Nostratic root *bal- (~ *bəl-): (vb.) *bal- 'to shine, to be bright'; (n.) *bal-a 'glitter, gleam, brightness'.

Bomhard reconstructs the following Proto-Nostratic forms for the second etymology based upon evidence from Afrasian, Dravidian, Indo-European, and Kartvelian: Proto-Nostratic root *bar- (~ *bər-): (vb.) *bar- 'to shine, to be bright, to sparkle, to flash'; (n.) *bar-a 'light, brightness; lightning'.

I did not fully understand these explanations. Here's what I know: There are both '**balkı, balkımak**' and '**parla, parlama, parkıra**' as the equivalent of "bright" in Turkish. One is compatible with IE root "bhel" and the other is compatible

with "bhereg" and "bhreu". Bright > parla > fire > bur; bhel > balkı (parla: to shine, to be bright; balkı: to shine; bur, parla: fire, flame)

5- *balʌ 'blind': Hamito-Semitic *bl 'blind' ~ Altaic *balʌ 'blind'. Strong.

Bomhard reconstructs the following Proto-Nostratic forms based upon evidence from Afrasian, Indo-European, Altaic, and Chukchi-Kamchatkan: Proto-Nostratic root *bal- (~ *bəl-): (vb.) *bal- 'to be or become dark, obscure, blind'; (n.) *bal-a 'darkness, obscurity, blindness'; (adj.) 'dark, obscure, blind'.

I haven't been able to verify this Altaic word in Turkish yet, which Bomhard stated. There may be many Eurasian Turkic words that he knows but I do not. Some of them may not be Turkish. I do not know yet.

6- *bari 'to take': Hamito-Semitic *br- 'to catch, to grab' ~ Indo-European *bher- 'to take, to bring, to carry' ~ (?) Dravidian *per- 'to pick up, to gather' ~ Altaic *bari- 'to take into the hands'. Possible.

It is better to derive Proto-Indo-European *bʰer-/*bʰor-/*bʰr̥- 'to bear, to carry; to bring forth, to bear children', *bʰernos/*bʰornos 'son, child' from the following Proto-Nostratic forms.

The roots of 'ver, ber, var, bar' in Turkish are both very productive and very complex. Intricate... 'ver, ber': give, provide; 'var' exists, there is; 'varlık': wealth, property; 'verim': productivity, fertility. 'Üre': breed, procreation and 'tabar, tavar': possessions, are possibly related to these as well. Ver, var, verim, varlık, üre, tabar > bear, fertile, taberna, ware, waare (German) etc.

7- *berg/i/ 'high': Hamito-Semitic *brg 'high' ~ (?) Kartvelian *br̥g-e 'high' ~ Indo-European *bherǵh-/*bhreǵh- 'high' ~ Uralic [*p/e/r/-kʌ/ 'high'] ~ (?) Dravidian *pēr- 'high'. Possible.

Turkish 'berk': solid, strong, fortified (?) / 'or, ur, urun': fortified position, place, city; 'burç' (Arabic, Turkish): tower, fortress, highest point of a castle... or, urun, ur, burç, berk (?) > berg, burg (town, city)

8- *be/rH/u 'to give': Hamito-Semitic [*br/H/ 'to give'] ~ Altaic [*bērü- 'to give']. Rejected. (?)

See item 6 ber, bar > bear (?)

9- *biĆa 'small': Uralic [*piĆa 'small'] ~ Dravidian *pīc-/*picc- 'small, short' ~ Altaic *biča 'small'. Rejected.

I don't know Altaic 'bica'. I know the Kyrgyz 'makar' (Radloff). It means small.
Micro > makar

10- *bičλ 'to break': Hamito-Semitic *bš-/*bq- 'to break, to smash, to press' ~ Kartvelian *bič- 'to break, to crumble' ~ Indo-European *peis- 'to smash, to crush, to press' ~ Dravidian *pīc- 'to smash, to shell, to knead'. Weak.

Turkish 'biç': reap, cut, harvest, chop. Biç > butcher / buçuk: half

11- *bilwi 'cloud': Hamito-Semitic *bjl 'heavenly waters, cloud' ~ Uralic *pilwe 'cloud' ~ Altaic [*buli-t 'cloud']. Rejected.

I object to Bomhard's statement of refusal to Svitic. There are many water-related words in Turkish that begin with 'ba, bu'. Balık, bataklık, banmak, batmak, balçık, buğu, bulut, bulama, bulanık, banyo, boğulmak (said to be Italian rooted, but not)... For example: 'buğu': vapor. The root 'bu' is important here, the rest is not. But 'bulut' and 'cloud' seem to be partners from somewhere. We cannot prove it yet. Maybe it's because the Turkish and English suffixes are too similar to each other, may be by roots.

12- *bolʔi 'to grow (of plants)': Hamito-Semitic *ʔbl 'leaf, growing plant' ~ Indo-European *bhelh̥-/ *bhleh̥- 'a plant, leaf, flower' ~ Dravidian [*poli- 'to grow, to bloom']. Strong.

Mol, bol > multi, poli; bollaşma: expansion or multiplication of a thing, a garment, a pipe, etc.

13- *bongä 'fat; to swell': Indo-European *bhenĝh- 'fat, thick' ~ Uralic *puŋka/*poŋka 'fat, swelling' ~ Dravidian *poŋk- 'to swell, to boil over' ~ (?) Altaic [*boŋʌ 'fat, big']. Strong.

I know 'moncuk, boncuk': bead, in Altaic Turkish. I thought it might be related to the 'moon' too. The word that Bombard writes is important. I will also research it.

14- *bor'a 'brown, grey-brown': Indo-European *bher-, *bhe-bhru-, *bhreu- 'brown' ~ Altaic *bor'a 'brown'. Strong.

So far, I have not come across such a root in Turkish or I do not remember it. I need to research. Bombard teaches us Turkish. Sincerely thanks.

15- *buHi 'to grow up, to arise': Indo-European *bheuH- 'to grow up; to become, to be' ~ Uralic *pu|e 'tree' ~ Altaic *büi- 'to be'. Strong.

PIE root 'bheuh' > büyü, büyümek / probably related to 'big' > büyük

16- *bulʌ 'precipitation; mud': Hamito-Semitic *b(w)l 'to moisten, to dampen; to mix' ~ (?) Indo-European *bhl-endh- 'turbid; to mix' ~ Altaic *bulʌ 'mud; to stir up, to mix'. Possible.

Balçık: mud; bula: smear; bulanık > blurry, blurred

17- bura 'to bore': Hamito-Semitic *b(w)r 'to bore, to dig; opening' ~ (?) Kartvelian [*br(u)- 'to turn'] ~ Indo-European *bher- 'to bore, to dig, to prick' ~ Uralic *pura 'instrument for boring; to bore, to hollow, to dig' ~ (?) Dravidian *pōr- 'opening' ~ Altaic [*bura- 'to turn, to bore']. Possible.

Burmak: to twist, to bore; boru: pipe; burgu: bract / bur, boru, burgu > bore > bract > bohrer (German) / boredom etc.

18- *bur(H)Λ/*bor(H)Λ 'porous soil, dust': Hamito-Semitic *b(w)r/*b(w)rH 'porous soil, soil, sand, dust' ~ (?) Kartvelian *bur|w- 'dust' ~ Uralic *porΛ 'dust, sand, dirt' ~ Dravidian *pūrΛ/*porΛ 'porous soil, sand, dust' ~ Altaic *bōr, *b/ū/r 'porous soil, limestone, dust'. Possible. (?)

Dust > toz

19- *burΛ 'snow (sand) storm': (?) Hamito-Semitic *bwr- '(sand) storm, wind' ~ Indo-European *bher- 'storm; to seethe' ~ Uralic *purΛ- 'whirl (of snow)', *purka 'blizzard' ~ Altaic *burΛ/*bora 'storm, blizzard'. Strong.

Bora > boreia (Greek, Latin) > The Hyperborea legend / St. Claus > Ayaz Ata legends / ice > ayaz / froze > buz etc.

20- *bur'a 'to boil, to bubble up': Hamito-Semitic *br- 'to boil' ~ Indo-European *bhreu- 'to boil, to bubble up' ~ Uralic *pura-/*pora- 'to boil, to gurgle' ~ Dravidian [*puṛ- 'to boil']. Strong.

Bur > fire, cook, roast / bul > boil

21- *büḳa 'to bend; bent': Indo-European *bheug-/*bheugh- 'to bend' ~ Altaic *bökä- 'to bend; bent'. Rejected.

Comment: Starostin—Dybo—Mudrak (2003:360—361) reconstruct ProtoAltaic *b₁ũkʼı (= *b₁ũkʼı) ‘to bow, to bend’. Proto-Altaic */kʼ/ (= */kʰ/) does not correspond to either Proto-Indo-European */g/ or */gh/.

I couldn't understand why Bombhard objected. Words coincide exactly with all their letters. Bomhard is either wrong or wants to say something else. PIE root ‘bheug’ > **büg, бүк** > bucklig > **büköng** (Radloff) > bogen, beugen (German) > buckle > bow / **bügde, bügsük, büğrü** (curved dagger, bud, breast, wry > **eğri**)

22- *būri ‘to cover’: Kartvelian *bur- ‘to cover, to darken’ ~ Dravidian *pūr- ‘to cover, to bury’ ~ Altaic ***būri**- ‘to cover’. Possible.

Bürü, bürümek: to cover; bury > **bürü** > burial

23- *b₁lH₁ ‘to blow, to inflate’: Kartvelian *bēr-/ *bēl- ‘to blow, to inflate’ ~ Indo-European *bhelh̥-/ *bhelh̥- ‘to blow, to swell’. Possible.

Ball, bulb, bull, balloon etc. **Bül, büllöz** (medical terms) PIE root: ‘bhel’ : to blow, swell > **polçok, bolçok**: ball, tumour; **bultay, bultak**: swelling (Radloff)

24- *b₁lH₁ ‘to tie, to bind’: Hamito-Semitic *bn̥ ‘to tie, to wrap’ ~ Indo-European *bhendh- ‘to tie’. Weak.

Bond, bandage, bag, ban (prohibit), bound, bandana > **bağ** (bandage, knot); **bağlama** (tie), **ban** (bound, prohibit), **bohça** (bag) / see item 1

25- *calu ‘to split, to cut’: Hamito-Semitic *sl- ‘to split, to cut, to point’ ~ Kartvelian *cel- ‘to mow, to cut’ ~ Indo-European *(s)kel- ‘to split’ ~ Uralic *sale- ‘to cut, to split’ ~ Dravidian cal- ‘to split, to cut’ ~ Altaic ***čalu**- ‘to cut’. Possible. (?)

Turkish ‘**çal**’: to hit (may be cut) (?)

26- *čiru 'pus, slush': Hamto-Semitic *t(j)r 'moist, feces' ~ Indo-European *(s)ter- 'slush, pus, feces' ~ Altaic *čirü- 'rot, decay'. Rejected. (?)

Turkish 'çürük, çürüme': rotten, decay, corruption / irin: pus, ichor / çürük > ichor > corrupt (PIE root: runp) > irin (?)

27- *cujħa 'thorn': Kartvelian *cxw- 'thorn, point' ~ Indo-European *skuei(H)- 'thorn' ~ (?) Dravidian *cī- 'thorn' ~ Altaic *čüjä 'thorn point'. Rejected.

Here I should point out some similarities than overlap. 'Sivri' means sharp in Turkish. 'Uç' means extreme, end, point. They are somewhat similar to the aforementioned roots, but I cannot claim anything at the moment. Skuei > sivri / Another similarity: Thorn > diken

28- *Cʌtʌ 'to cover': Hamito-Semitic [*str/*štr 'to cover (clothe), to protect'] ~ Indo-European *(s)ked- 'to cover (clothe)'. Rejected.

Cʌtʌ > str > (s)ked > ört (same meaning but slight similarity in sounds).

29- *Curl 'herd (wild animals)': Hamito-Semitic *s(w)r/*šwr 'herd (wild animals)' ~ Uralic *śurl 'herd of deer'. Rejected.

Comment: Faulty sound correspondences.

Maybe Bomhard is right, but I should add a few things. Herd > horde > sürü > ordu (army, crowd)

30- *čap'a 'to beat, to chop': Hamito-Semitic [*sP- 'to beat, to hit'] ~ Indo-European *skep- 'to split' ~ Uralic *čappa- 'to chop, to beat' ~ Dravidian [*cava- 'to chop'] ~ Altaic *čap(a)- 'to beat, to chop'. Weak.

Turkish 'çap': to hit, to cut, go quick; 'çapa': hoe; çapkı: sickle; çubuk: thin stick (chopped); çubuk: hollow bar, for example for smoking / chop, chopper > çap,

çapa / related to 'çaba': effort, endeavour; çabuk: quick; chop chop > çabuk
çabuk (exactly same) (?) / cuppare (Latin): to behead > çop / Turkish
'tchoubouq' (çubuk) > tubus, tubulus (Latin) > tube / Sabot, saboteur, Zapata >
çap, çabat (piece of wood) (?) "Sabot" was allegedly originally Turkish. / As can
be seen, it is not enough to go over only the similarity of sound and meaning in
comparisons. Conceptual trails and conceptual commonalities are just as
important. If this is done, new rules of sound changes can be found out.

31- *ćina 'to know': Hamito-Semitic *s(j)n 'to know' ~ Kartvelian *c₁an-/*c₁n-
'to know'. Rejected. Comment: Faulty sound correspondences.

Kan-mak, kanı: to believe, be deceived, opinion > kennen, bekannt (German) >
know > gnosis (Latin, Greek)

32- *ćel λ 'to jump': (?) Hamito-Semitic *šl- 'to jump' ~ Indo-European *(s)kel-
'to jump' ~ Uralic *ćelλ- 'to jump' ~ (?) Dravidian [*cEl-ai 'source, waterfall'] ~
Altaic [*č/e/λ 'to limp, to stumble']. Rejected.

Comment: Faulty sound correspondences; lax semantics.

Sek, sek-mek: skip, leap / sek > skip > (s)kel

33- *Ćaλ 'to tickle': Uralic *ćik(k)λ 'to tickle' ~ Dravidian *cakk- /*ćank- 'to
tickle' ~ (?) Altaic [*čik-/*ćakλ- 'to tickle']. Rejected. (?)

Tickle > gıdık, gıdıklama (?)

34- *Ćarλ 'hardened crust': Indo-European *sker- '(ice) crust, scab' ~ Uralic
*ćarλ '(hardened) film' ~ Dravidian *carλ 'rough' ~ Altaic *čar(λ) 'hardened
crust'. Possible.

PIE: sker > crust > kuru (dry, dried, hard) > hartı (hard) > kat, katı (hard) > sert
(Persian, Turkish) (hard)

Source (reference) 8

The leading words are Proto-Nostratic, the red ones are Turkish, my notes are orange

35- Papa: old man, old woman / baba: father; aba, apa: senior person / Pope > papa > father > ata > baba

36- Pul, pol: swell / ball > balloon > polçok, bolçok / see item 23

37- Put, pot: to cut, break, tear / battle, beat > patak, pat, bat (beat, to hit); batır (jab, stick, sting, stab)

38- T'al: drip, fall in drops, sprinkle, to wet, to moisten PIE: T'el, t'ol / tam (Old Turkish), damla (new Turkish): drop (?) / dal-dırma: immersion, dip / to keep in mind

39- T'al: to lick / yalga, yala: to lick; til, dil: tongue, language

40- T'aph: to strike, to beat, to pound PIE: T'eph, t'oph; Proto Altaic: Taphv / tep: to strike, tepük: kick

41- T'ar: tear, rend, cut, rip... PIE: T'er, t'or / tear, torment > tar (break up, scatter)

42- T'aw: to hit, to strike PIE: T'ew, T'ow / döv (beat, pound)

43- T'ay: elder male relative, PIE: T'ay-wr, Altaic: tayv / dayı (elder male relative, mother's brother)

45- T'ay: to shine, to gleam, bright; PIE: t'ey, t'oy; Etruscan: tin (day) / toğ, tuğ, doğ: sunrise / t'ay > day > doğ > tin > gün (day)

46- T'e: to say, to speak PIE: T'e, Altaic: te / de, demek > dicere (Latin) > tell

47- T'il, T'el: to say, to tell, PIE: T'el / **de, demek** > tell > **dil** (language, tongue)

48- T'il: language, tongue PIE: tinghu, tingwa (tongue) / **de, demek** > **dicere** > tell > **dil** (tongue, language)

49- T'uly: wedge, peg; PIE: t'ul; Altaic: **tiulyu** / (?) / **del**: pierce, hole, bore; **delgi**: drill, punch

50- K'ab: to seize, to take hold of, to seize with the teeth / **captura, capiens** (Latin) > **kapmak** (grab, seize) > capture

51- K'ak: to cackle, to chatter, crakling sound, PIE: k'ak / **kıkırdama, kahkaha** (laughter, cackling), **keklik** (cackling bird)

52- K'al: to burn, roast, cook; PIE: k'el, k'ol; coal, charcoal / **caleo** (latin), **calorie** > **kala** (burn, ignite), **kalat** (burn), **cılı** (hot, warm) > coal

53- K'al: to come into being, to be born, existence, presence, birth; PIE: k'al: pregnant, young of animals / **kal** (remain, to stay, to stop, be left, stand); **gebe kalmak** (be pregnant)

54- K'an: to get, to acquire, to posses, to produce PIE: k'en, k'on / **Does it have something to do with 'can'? 'Ken'** is the noun suffix in Turkish gives the same meaning. It makes nouns from verbs.

55- K'an: jaw, cheek; PIE: k'enu / **çene** > chin, gena (latin) / chew > **çiğne**

56- K'an: to bend, twist, turn; PIE: k'en, k'on / **kanırt**: to try to twist something loose, to bent

57- K'an: knob, knot, joint; PIE: k'en, k'on / **Con** (Latin - English prefix) (be together), knot, knob > **kon, konmak** (to land, to settle, perch, sit, enter on,

enter upon); konuşmak (conversation); konşu, komşu (neighbour), kenet (connect, clamp)

58- K'any: to observe, perceive, recognition, comprehension; PIE: k'en, k'on, kno, know / kwo > kanı, kanmak: to believe, be deceived, opinion > kennen, bekannt (German) > know > gnosis (Latin, Greek)

59- K'aph: jaw, jawbone; PIE: k'eph; Proto-Altaic: k'epha (?)

60- K'ar: to shout, to call; PIE: k'er, k'or: to call out / çağır, çığır: to call, to shout, scream

61- K'ar: dark, dark colored; PIE: krukos (Greek): dirty; crock: dirty / kara, karanlık: black, dark; kara: bad, dirty / krukos > dark > kara, karanlık

62- K'ar: to twist, to turn, to bend, to wind; PIE: k'er, k'or, k'r; Proto-Altaic: kera / kıvrır (curl, bend), kıvrık (curv) / kıvrır, kıvrık > curl > curve

63- K'aw: to bend, twist, curve; PIE: k'ew, k'ow, k'u / kıvrır (curl), kavis (Arabic?-Turkish): curve, kavlamak: to swell

64- K'aw: to take, to seize, to grasp, hold; PIE: k'ow / kavra-mak: to grasp, grip, clasp

65- K'el: female in-law, husband's sister; PIE: k'alow, k'aloc; Proto-Altaic: kele / gelin: daughter in law, bride

66- K'eny: knot, joint; PIE: k'enu, k'nu; knee; Proto-Altaic: kenya: front leg, armpit, angle (?)

67- K'ep: to cut, chop, break, break into small pieces, to chew; Proto-Altaic: kepu (chew) (?) / çap, çöp: to cut, break into small pieces

68- K'er: to decay, wear out, to become old; PIE: k'er, k'or; Altaic: **keru**: old, warn out / **kari, keru, kart**: old, worn > geriatric, geriatry

FROM AN ARTICLE OF G. STRATOSIN AND HIS COLLEAGUES ABOUT INDIAN EUROPEAN – NOSTRATIC – TURKISH HARMONY (9)

Someones say that the obvious proofs I have shown are not derived using scientific methodology. As if science had a formal essence separate from its essence. The scientific form is scientific if it serves the essence, otherwise it is juggling. Here is a perfect study of Kassian and his friends in terms of scientific method. In terms of sampling rigor, statistical method, etc. These authors calculated IE-Nostratic-Ural overlaps with a 50-word Swadesh list. I do the same thing by subtracting Ural and adding Turkish based on their article. The list is the same list. The results are out there. Do you also need a calculation or statistics? $2 \times 2 = 4$: Do you know a statistical method to prove this?

*The first ones are in English, the **purple** ones are Proto-Indo-European, my notes are **orange**, the **red** ones are Turkish*

1- Ashes / **xa:s** / **köz** (ember), **is** (soot)

2- Black / **krs-no**, **mele*n**, **dheng** / **bele**, **bula** (to pollute, to smudge, to smear) / **bele** > black > **mele'n** > **melena** (black feces – medical term)

3- Die / **wel** / **öl**

4- Drink / **eg**, **heg** / **iç**

5- Ear / **ows**, **xows**, **hevs** / **kulak** (ear), **ku** (sound)

6- Eat / **ed** / **et-mek** (do), **et-mek** (eat), **et** (meat)

- 7- Fire / pex-wr, peh-wr, ng-n-i / bur, parlama (fire, ignition) > fire > burn
- 8- Foot / pod / but (foot, leg)
- 9- Hear / kylev / ku (sound), kulak (ear)
- 10- Heart / kyerd / yürek, cörök (heart)
- 11- I am / egy / me, eme / ben, men (me, my, I am); 'm' suffix denotes the first person singular in Turkish
- 12- Meat / mems / et
- 13- Mouth / oy-es / os, ossium (Latin) (opening, mouth) > ağız
- 14- Name / nom / nimi (Ural) / nam (Persian, Turkish), ün (sound, fame, name)
- 15- Not / no, ne / ne (denotes negativity): ne o, ne bu (neither this nor that)
- 16- One / syo / PIE root: oi-no (etymonline.com) > ön (front, first)
- 17- Rain / xeyu, suwe / yağmur, yağış, sağnak (rain, rains, fall, downpour)
- 18- Smoke / dhuxw, duhuh / duman
- 19- Tail / puk, sis, ses / tel (thread, hair, hair or feather extension), Gothic 'tagl': hair
- 20- Thong / Dnghyva, lal, lol / kali (Ural) / dil (tongue, language), lal (Persian, Turkish): mute, voiceless
- 21- Tooth / dont, edont / tiş, diş > tooth, teeth
- 22- Tree / doru / terek, direk: pole, beam, tree; tura (tower, building, pole, beam, door (?); dura (Latin), durable > durabilir (tough, hard, resistant) > dur: stand, repose, resist etc. / ağaç (tree) > agacha (Sanskrit)

23- We / **wey-s** / **biz** > us, uz (the suffix denotes first person plural)

24- What / **kwi** / **kanki, hanki** (which, what); **kim, kimin** (who, whose)

25- Who / **kwi** / **kim, kimin** (who, whose)

Side-linked, indirectly related or controversial ones

26- Bone / **xost** / **os, osseus** (Latin): bone > **sök** (Radloff) (bone), **aşık** (ankle bone)

27- Egg / **owyo, xowyo** / **yumurta**

28- Eye / **ook, ok** / **oku**: read, see, perceive

29- Horn / **kyr-ew-r** / **boynuz**

30- Liver / **yekw-r** / **ciğer, ciger** (liver)

31- Night / **ksep** / **gece**

32- New / **new** / Proto-Germanic 'neuja'; Gothic 'niujis'; Latin 'novus', Persian 'nev', Turkish '**yeni, yengi**'. Those who do etymology by calculating letters won't be convinced, but I think the link is clear / young > civan (Persian) > juvenis (Latin) > **genç**

33- Sun / **sa:wel, sehwell** / **sol, sol-ma** (fade, wither, discolored) > sol, solar (Latin) (sun) / **sallow** (pale, yellow) > **sarı** (yellow)

34- Thou / **ti, tu** / ti-n (Ural) / **sen** (you) (?)

35- Two / **dwo** / kit:a (Ural) / **iki, ikinci** > second (leading 's' added later)

ADDITIONAL

A final word on grammar and morphology.

Before conveying Kisamov's views on this subject, I should say a few words about grammar. In another article, I explained that Indo-European languages do not show a big harmony regarding their grammars (10). There are even serious differences. Moreover, I explained that the grammar of some Indo-European languages and Turkish show great structural similarities. Two small additions to what I wrote there:

English 'able' Turkish "bil, abil, ebil": yap-abil-mek: to be able to... perfect harmony. This alone leaves a deep question mark about the level of commonality of the two languages. Such strong 9-10 examples are enough to prove the commonality. Whereas I've shown hundreds of powerful examples already here.

Another addition is the strong connotation of German inseparable (meaningless) prefixes with Turkish. This could be the subject of an article in itself.

THE MORPHOLOGY OF TURKISH AND ITS RELATION TO THE STRUCTURE OF WESTERN LANGUAGES - NORM KİSAMOV (11):

The quantity of the Türkic stems is not large, they comfortably fit into single volume linguistic dictionaries. Prefixes are structurally counter indicated, they impact the root and baffle the crisp mechanism of semantic content. Instead of prefixes are used prepositions, audibly identical to prefixes. The accent on the last syllable leaves the root portion undisturbed in any environment, while internalization in English moves the accent to the first syllable. These simple structural conventions secure the distinct endurance of the root system. Words are formed starting with a single morpheme (of which Eng. preserved just one, ö, the word awe), first by agglutinating distinguishing functional morphemes one at a

time, then by agglutinating semantical morpheme units (like -lig- “like”), ending up with verbal conjugational morpheme units. Generally, the logical structure of the language allows to trace a word through a linked chain of derivatives to its source, that is a monumental difference between the Türkic and the IE languages with their haphazard mix of agglutinative and random (borrowings and amalgamation) word-forming practice that can't be called “procedure” with the absence of such. Unlike the IE word-forming practice, the Türkic practice is usually predictable in both directions, with the loanwords standing out; that makes the science of Turkologists incompatibly easier than the tortured science of the Indoeuropeistics.

A common feature of the base roots is their two-dimensional semantics, one immediate, and one implied; both sememes may develop derivatives, with the immediate derivative carrying over the implied meaning (like “do something” vs. “do something together”), and the implied derivatives directly continuing implicated sememe but indirectly implying the base meaning (like “together (do something)”). This bifurcated semantics may puzzle a student who sees only a direct meaning, and erroneously concludes that there is no connection between a base root and its derivative; or the connection may appear to be too far-fetched to be credible; while an understanding of the implied notion puts connection in proper perspective (like “stopover” also implies “bunching together”, and thus “tribe”, “crowd”, “companions”, and the like). Frequently, the subject of the implied semantics is not included in a phrase, and a translator of the phrase puts the crucial implied subject in parentheses for the phrase to make sense. The two-dimensional semantics first appears in the linguistic relicts, the single-syllable stems, and continues undiminished well into the era of technological revolutions marked by lexical expansion into construction, metallurgy, and producing pastoralism, when grammatical developments supplanted notional expressions with morphological means to form precise semantic variety by an assortment of grammatical modifications. The use of agglutinative method (Cf. -iř as cooperative mood marker) made unnecessary the use of implied semantics (Cf. “together” as a derivative of “bunch together”, an implied notion of the word “stopover”). At times, from the distance of ages, the base notion may retreat to a background blanketed by its derivatives; that may result in misguided etymology (Cf. řarp, Eng. “sharp”, with a base notion of “steep incline” essential in the mountainous pasturing, it can be used and interpreted as “rough”, “inaccessible”,

“difficult”, “tapered”, even “acerbic (taste)”, etc., with the physical base notion on the plains' pasturing atrophied). In a single-dimension linguistic world, the two-dimensionality of the often metaphorical notional semantics may be an impediment. A tree appears as a bush, with stalk obscured by the crown.

A common phonetic feature of the Türkic languages is a somewhat wild, somewhat organized alternation mirrored, for example, by the strongly pronounced Germanic d/z alternation shared with the Türkic family. The most prominent of them are the m/b and z/d/y alternations. Phonetic alternations from the beginning were probably a consequence of amalgamations, and of consecutive amalgamations thereafter. The m/b bifurcation is most telling, the peculiar coexistence of the m/b alternation within the same communities endured for 7 millennia and has survived into the present times, occasionally within a single family the alternation is not registered by the speakers or listeners themselves. Traces of the m/b divide extend far beyond the Türkic milieu, extending across the eastern and western parts of the Eurasia and crossing barriers between linguistic families, with a heavy imprint within the entire IE family. The oldest traces of the m/b alternations are visible in Sumerian, they are also a trait in the Finno-Ugric family including Hungarian. Sumers are believed to have migrated to Mesopotamia between ca 5500 and 4000 BC from the area between Caspian Sea and Hindu Kush and Kopet Dag mountains, about the area of the modern Turkmenistan. They carried an R1b-M269 subclade haplogroup marker (Klyosov A., 2012, p. 87on). The genetical and archeological datings are largely consistent. Suggestions on a temporal priority of one phoneme over the other are unsupportable. The Sumer migrants were but an offshoot of the R1b migration flow, a sidestream of the much greater demographical situation marked by numerous other R1b subclades.

The English, via Anglo-Saxon, lost most of the Türkic suffixes, and added some to its morphology. The modern Turkish retained most of the suffixes, reactivated some that were out of use, and simplified orthography, collecting some phonetically close phonemes under a common symbol. The following listing of the Turkish suffixes allows to highlight modern English suffixes genetically connected with the modern Turkish suffixes; as a body, they constitute a stand-alone paradigm that inescapably attest to the common genesis, a paradigmatic transfer evidence in concert with all other systemic cases of paradigmatic transfer. One of the most significant Türkic suffixes is –t that forms deverbal nouns. The final

–t in Anglo-Saxon and English nouns is a good pointer to locate the underlying verbal stems for the nominal derivatives, Cf. Türkic bert “tax, return” (ber- “to give”), ölüt “killing” (ölür- “kill”), бүтүт “completion” (bütür- “finish, complete”); English port “harbor” (bar- “depart”), unit “part of” (una- “agree”), gift “present” (kiv- “give”). Since the suffix –t in English lost its original function, it became an indelible part of the root: port, unit, gift. (...)

A careful examination of the lexicons of 42+ Türkic languages (the vague number reflects the current state of affairs, not the actual number) would likely produce forms that are genetically nearer to the historical and current English forms. Comparison of the English and Türkic lexicons is largely limited to the root forms, with not infrequent cases of the Türkic suffixes embedded into the English word stem. English was already heavily creolized when the Anglo-Saxons brought it over to the Albion, but the traces of its substrate are still fossilized in the lexis and morphology, and the agglutinated suffixation is an ingrained and burgeoning part of its morphology. (...)

The IE etymology tends to follow a path of deriving verbs from nouns. The Türkic linguistic tendency is the opposite, the prime stem is mostly verbal, the noun semantic is a derivative. The difference is of a cardinal nature for understanding the IE lexicon of the Türkic origin. Among the Indo-European languages the Türkic verbal-nominal homonymy, the system of roots in Türkic languages where the verbal root also serves as a noun, in a most developed form is represented in English, but albeit in an incomplete form is also known in some other European languages (Sevortyan, 1974, 39). The English and Türkic innately share this morphological feature. English has stand (v.) and stand (n., adj.), sit (v.) and seat (n.), sleep (v.) and sleep (n.), with uncounted others, and continues to productively use this inherited Türkic word-forming vehicle. In the Türkic languages, the productivity of the verbal-nominal homonymy faded by the Middle Ages, but in English this ancient Türkic linguistic backbone experienced its Renaissance before the 13th c., and still keeps developing, illustrating a spiral conversion trend in the linguistic processes.

The IE linguistic paradigm is built on attested lexicon, non-attested lexicon, and phonology to explain the linguistic past seen from the perch of the viewer, with little or none attention paid to morphology or syntax. The PIE dictionaries are widely available, they inventory the attested lexicons and suggest non-attested *reconstructed forms, ostensibly in their stripped

state, without morphological modifiers, but in fact frequently confusing unperceived suffixes with parts of the stems. The modifiers are structured individually by IE linguistic branch, i.e. Proto-Germanic, Proto-Slavic, etc., but they did not come from the same tree, and even conceptually are not compatible across the IE family. Accordingly, there are no PIE morphological dictionaries, nor a PIE morphological inventory. Such a pathetic state, after generations of linguists spent gargantuan efforts on PIE, has a good reason, reflected in the competing models of the linguistic development: the absence of any trace of commonality.

In the usage frequency statistics, morphological elements are buried with the words, making it impossible to assess the extent and the role morphological elements of different provenance play in forming a language. A cursory qualitative assessment readily shows importance of some morphemes: the listing of words beginning with negation element *un-*, an allophone of the Türkic negation element *aŋ/an*, far exceeds the number of words with stems starting with *un-* (undue “not due” vs. unary “single”): of the approximately 320 words beginning with *una-*, only 5 stems start so; in this case the amplification factor of the single morphological element *un-* thus exceeds a factor of 60, it enormously enriches English vocabulary, empowers its expressiveness, and enables stinting communication, all without a hint of a due statistical credit. (...)

In Türkic linguistic family numbering 42+ languages, stem defines notion, and grammatical constructs are formed by agglutinating suffixes specific for parts of speech. With some exceptions, English lost many suffixes at some pra-English stage; thus the Türkic generic stems became English verbs and nouns without functional markers; in English, they are used at random as verbs, nouns, and verbal or noun adjectives, and then they develop various verbal and noun derivatives. Both in English and Türkic, the suffixation method is extremely productive, it allows to create the same notions with different nuances from a variety of unrelated stems, like *cloudy*, *dimly*, *murky*, *shady* in English and 20+ forms for *greedy* in Türkic, greatly enriching the language. In Türkic, the verbal form of the stem is predominant in forming nouns and other derivatives, which in turn may develop, in a spiral fashion, verbs from the derivative nouns and adjectives. With time, some Türkic suffixes waned from active use, remaining active relicts, while the replacement suffixes rose; parallel usage of relict and active suffixes is normal, with different forms at times acquiring differing semantics. In some

cases, the English substrate and loanwords stick out because they carry imbedded vestiges of the long-gone Türkic suffixes.

In any language, lexis alone does not make a language. A collection of structural grouping of sound bits aligned into morphemes and words that constitutes lexis is no different from a pile of components in a scrap pit, be it a ruined cathedral or electronic refuse stripped of precious metals, that is an unidimensional pile. A second dimension is a structure, it made the cathedral before its ruin and a computer before salvaging, it makes a language. The structure of a language makes it a systematic means of communication to convey meaning. At the sound level, closely related dialects may differ wildly one from each other while at the structure level the same wildly differing dialects would be nearly identical. In the accepted classification typology with linear order of precedence, the Türkic and Germanic languages are classed as SOV-type, while English lost its initial SOV structure, and replaced it with a rigid SVO-type, obliterating a significant former structural commonality between English and the domain of the Germanic group. Of the complexity of the Germanic group SOV languages, represented by Dutch, German, and Frisian languages, with their main clauses SVO and embedded clauses SOV, English retained the SVO order of the main clauses. English shares genderless typology with the West Frisian and Türkic, and shares indiscriminate treatment of female gender with the Scandinavian, Frisian, and Türkic. The absence of grammatical gender indicator is not the same as the absence of the gender, it is the absence of the load of the grammatical gender synchronization between parts of speech. The gender is conveyed by other means without any synchronization effort (Cf. Türkic prepositions *er*, *kız* “man, girl” vs. Eng. *she*-), and only when it is relevant. As a group, Germanic languages have never digested completely the alien gender grammar. Of the Germanic languages, even though the links are present, German is distinguished by weak and erratic link between declension and gender, gender and sex. Agglutination within the Germanic group varies from minimal to heavy. The erratic typology within the Germanic group is consistent with the substrate/adstrate concept. If a presence of systemic grammatical gender was used in the definition of the IE family, the size of the family would be greatly diminished.

It is generally believed, with a support of historical examples, that a phenomenon of a widespread multilingualism (bilingualism in a minimal case) is needed to affect a structural change of the language. Under that premise, a linguistic structural change is a manifestation

of the multilingualism, it is an effect of amalgamation. History of English allows to discern interference patterns of recurring amalgamations, with Anglo-Saxon carrying a major doze of Türkic lexical and morphological inheritance, Turkisms from other sources (primarily Frisian) overlay the resultant blend with the Anglo-Saxon component, the Romance layer carried over another load of Turkisms, and each one either directly impacted the structure of the English, or created conditions for a needed change. In such dynamic situation no conclusions are obtainable with static methods of discrete universe for each conglutinate language, internal reconstruction, lexicostatistics, or glottochronology, or they are easily vitiated when drawn with such methods.

A syntactical feature shared by the English and Türkic is the wide use of paired words - idioms, frequently used as compound words: horsetail and horse tail, bluegrass and blue grass, etc. Some words have dozens of such pairs, in English blackback, blackball, Blackbeard, etc., in Türkic qara aç, qara baş - qarabaş, qara boyuq, etc. Phonetically, the compounds and paired words are indistinguishable, the spelling is purely conventional. And all languages have polysemantic words; English and Türkic lexicons contain thousands of them; and miraculously, frequently the specific polysemantic meanings survived from the substrate Türkic into the modern English: yer/earth are both land and dirt, tili/talk are both a communication process and a story, etc. This mechanical transfer of polysemantic word from a language to language complete with the word's polysemantic meanings is a main indicator of the genetic connection, in contrast with the loanwords, which are borrowed with a specific semantic meaning when a receiving language adopts a word with only a meaning it needs to fill in. Below are cited numerous examples of polysemantic meanings carried over to English.

An univocal syntactical feature shared by English and Türkic is the use of predicate nouns with marker of belonging instead of accusative case: in Türkic “my uncle” with agglutinated suffix, in English “my uncle” with a pronoun instead of an article; thus “father loves her”, but “she loves her father”, and not “she loves father” or “she loves the father” ~ “ella ama a su padre” (Romance), but “she loves father” ~ “она любит отца” (Slavic). In Türkic example Huar-Ases (Suar-Ases) > Chorasm > Horezm “(land) of River People”; there -m is the Türkic possessive marker, a forerunner of the English “my”.

Another notable univocal feature that until 19th c. was shared by the English and Türkic is the now forgotten English passival reflexive form, where progressive aspect of a verb (Eng. -ing, Tr. -inç) was used in active voice with passive semantics ("breakfast eating" ~ being eaten), equivalent to the reflexive forms apparently ascending to the European Sprachbund vernaculars that existed in the Central Europe before the crucial events of the 3rd mill. BC. Relicts of that form are preserved in Eng., Dan., Sp., It., Lith., Serb., Pol.: pre- or postposition self/sig/se/si/save/se/sie (ascending to the Tr. öz "self") respectively, and suffix sya in Russ., all meaning "self" and forming reflexive semantics where the object is the subject. This now lost English form was creolized very late, in the 19th c.; in the Shakespearean time it was still active, and Johnny could be bathing (i.e. bathing himself), house could be building (i.e. building itself ~ to be under construction), breakfast could be eating (i.e. eat itself ~ be consumed), and lovers could be kissing (i.e. kissing themselves ~ kissing each other). In Türkic, the passival form is formed with the suffixes -m/-im/-um/-üm and nearly universal stem 'öz' "self", all denoting "me, mine, self". The 'öz', grammatically pre- and postposition, is a forerunner of the English possessive -'s, and European variations of pre- and postpositions "self".

Till the Middle Ages and the input of foreign writers into the Türkic literary languages mostly via religious translations, Türkic languages did not know relative pronouns. In Türkic, suffixation serves the relative function. That inheritance is still prominent in modern English; while the presence of relative pronouns is characteristic, in particular, of the written Standard English, the standard variety has influenced the dialectal English, but had not taken over. The verbal use of relative pronouns is still subdued, with the absence (zero case) of relative pronouns reaching 30%, and a single particle that takes another 40%; the combined 6 relative pronouns share less than 40%, and that in spite of the absence of the suffixation tool available in the Türkic languages.

Another distinct feature shared by Germanic and Türkic languages is rhotacism. Rhotacism is one of the main traits that separate Oguz (-s-) and Ogur (-r-) languages, to a degree that these groups are defined as an s-language versus r-language. This preeminent trait is continued to the Germanic languages, notable, among others, in the Dutch (Y-DNA R1b 70%, R1a 4%) -s plurals and (by rhotacism) Scandinavian (Swedes, Y-DNA R1b 17%, R1a 21%) -r plurals. The ratios of the Y-DNA components point that Y-DNA R1b marker is correlated with

the -s- form, and Y-DNA R1a marker is correlated with the -r- form. The same separation appears among the Türkic ethnicities historically connected with the Oguz (Common Türkic) and Ogur (Karluk subgroup, Uigurs, Uzbeks) groups, and is supported by paleogenetic testing.

Both English and Türkic have a preference for closed syllables ending with a consonant morpheme. That proclivity may be reversed passing through a language with an opposite tendency for open syllables ending with a vowel morpheme. The most frequent adaptation of a closed syllable by the alien linguistic inertia is by adding a prosthetic consonant in front of the initial vowel (VC > CVC). The initial vowel may be dropped (Cf. Türkic *apat* vs. IE *pat* “leg”, Cf. *podiatry*, *peddler*, *pedal*). Because such changes are caused by structural and not phonetic adaptations, such adaptations are unexplainable phonetically, as also are unexplainable the cases of metathesis (e.g. *ab* > *ba* etc.). The mere observations are routinely stated as exhaustive explanations: “h is often wrongly prefixed to words, as in Cockney English” (Hall J.R.C., 1916, p. 142). In Slavic, and shared by some Germanic languages, a prosthetic s- is systemically appended in front of the root, or is appended a prefix s- marking the perfect tense, the two can be easily confused. The systemic nature of prosthetic consonants is suggested by the mass of cases in the present study, these cases as a paradigmatic body extend a conspicuous diagnostic and tracing opportunity for the direction of borrowing and the nature of the guest and host languages. Systemic inattention to the structural and morphological properties of the languages in favor of the lexical content is perilous for etymological screening.

At each stage on their historical path, communities encountered alien communities and formed their unique lingua franca. Linguistic changes reflected initial idiosyncrasies for each unique situation. Each situation predicated its unique results at the terminal point, which marked a belonging to the previous stage, and a beginning of the next stage. It is impossible to account for all the past stages, for all the past players, for the murky linguistic relations during each stage. With so many largely unknown variables, any generalizations have their uncertainty and defined limits, both of which are critical in significance but can't be defined for the prehistorical and most of the historical periods. None of the phonetic changes are predictable either backward nor forward. Consequently, the most that can be accurately stated etymologically is the vague “usual phonetic changes” and “few vowel variations”.

Without a statistical assessment of the entire body of evidence for each variable parameter encapsulated between two terminal points, any assertion is no more than a hypothesis lacking a factual foundation.

A correlation between centum (k) and satem (s) languages in Europe is similar to the situation with the r/s alternation. In most -k- lands (Celtic, Italic, and Germanic), R1a is the significant population component. R1a comes close to a minority in most -s- lands, where it may be compatible with the R1b content (Slavic). Comparing France (cent, -s-, R1b 50%, R1a 10%, I 30%) and Germany (hundert, -k-, R1b 50%, R1a 25%, I 25%), the main difference is with the R1a extent, and it correlates with the switch, from R1b -s- and small R1a, to -k- with greater R1a. It appears that relatively greater R1a tends to shift -s- to -k-. That observation is consistent with the earlier dating of the R1a and the earlier origin of the velar fricative in parallel with k- and q-. The corollary of that process may be a conclusion that the vicinities of the Aral-Caspian area, extending to the north to the Urals and in the south to the Mesopotamia, where the k/s furcation is most pronounced, initially were predominantly peopled by the R1a -k- type populations. The modern predominance of the -s- type in that area was caused by later migrations.

The European s/k divide is shared by the Türkic family, with a mirrored symmetry predicated by the demographic events. Within the Türkic milieu, the divide is more like s/h in today's Romanized form. The -s- form is now predominant across Eurasia, the -h- form is scattered around the fringes, largely coexisting with and being supplanted by the dominant -s- form, except for the Alats/Khalajes who live in the -h- area. The modern spread of literacy and the influence of the titular languages tend to isolate and dilute the relict -h- islands. Still, the divide is very tangible (the Swadesh 100 list's examples are from Dybo 2013, total 11 examples): "all, entire" Tat. saw, Bashk. haw; "belly" CT ičiksi, Sary-Yig. hijigi; "cold" Tat. sumk, Bashk. himk; "die" Tat. ül-, Khalaj hil-/hel-; "egg" Chuv. smarda, Dolgan himit; "far" Khalaj hiraq, Yig. iraq; "fat" Tat. simez, Bashk. himeδ; "kill" Tat. üter-, Khalaj hilär-; "thou" Tat. sin, Bashk. hin; "warm" Kumyk isi, Khalaj hissi; "water" Tat. su, Uzb. suv, Bashk. hiw. The -h- examples are limited to the Bashk. (5), Khalaj (4), Sary-Yig. (1), and Dolgan (1) languages, a tiny surviving relict of once dominant linguistic subdivision now extending to the European languages. The divide affords diagnostic value for the European linguistic pedigree.

LAST WORD

M. K. Atatürk, the founder of the Republic of Türkiye, developed a theory of language and history in the last years of his short life. He started a major breakthrough. His theory of language is known as the **Sun-Language** theory. Significant scientific method errors were made in the formulation of the theory and at the beginning of the study. Some extremes have been made. But the theory was correct in both intuition and substance. Here are the views we advocate. During the Atatürk period, the number of foreign and local scientists who would support these arguments was very limited. Gathering scientific evidence was very difficult. Much of what we know today was unknown. Atatürk's works met with great resistance from inside and outside the country. Not long after, Atatürk died (1938). In his last moments, as his last words unconsciously he said: "Dil efendim... Dil..." (Lingua ma'am - sir... Lingua...) As soon as he died, the political regime in Turkey quickly moved away from his basic views and politically banned his theory of language and history. Atatürk was declared almost a kind of prophet, a secular prophet, almost a halo was put on his head... His views and works were kept in locked archives. This theory is still politically and ideologically banned in Türkiye. Let the academicians from other nationalities not think that while we are defending our views here and elsewhere, we see support from Turkish intellectuals and scientists. The vast majority are against these views, believing in the western mindset and IE nonsense. Support for these views in scientific circles comes less from Turks, mostly from non Turkish academicians. However, the facts are revealed one by one. Here is new work by Bomhard and others. These are treasures. In science, truth comes with a delay, but it does come.

REFERENCES

1- Alexander Kozintsev, New lexicostatistical data on the southern adstrate in proto-Indo-European

[https://www.academia.edu/40550608/New lexicostatistical data on the southern adstrate in proto Indo European](https://www.academia.edu/40550608/New_lexicostatistical_data_on_the_southern_adstrate_in_proto_Indo_European)

2-

[https://www.academia.edu/72572431/Discussion with Anatole Klyosov on an article I wrote about Proto Turkish at the root of Western languages](https://www.academia.edu/72572431/Discussion_with_Anatole_Klyosov_on_an_article_I_wrote_about_Proto_Turkish_at_the_root_of_Western_languages)

3 -

[https://www.academia.edu/74539984/Breaking an Indo European disinformation myth Sumerian is Turkic](https://www.academia.edu/74539984/Breaking_an_Indo_European_disinformation_myth_Sumerian_is_Turkic)

4- Xsavier Rouard, DID INDO-EUROPEAN LANGUAGES STEM FROM A TRANS-EURASIAN ORIGINAL LANGUAGE? AN INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACH LES LANGUES INDO-EUROPÉENNES SONT-ELLES ISSUES D'UNE LANGUE ORIGINELLE TRANS-EURASIENNE ? UNE APPROCHE INTERDISCIPLINAIRE, academia.edu

[https://www.academia.edu/74067043/DID INDO EUROPEAN LANGUAGES STEM FROM A TRANS EURASIAN ORIGINAL LANGUAGE AN INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACH LES LANGUES INDO EUROPEENNES SONT ELLES ISSUES DUNE LANGUE ORIGINELLE TRANS EURASIENNE UNE APPROCHE INTERDISCIPLINAIRE](https://www.academia.edu/74067043/DID_INDO_EUROPEAN_LANGUAGES_STEM_FROM_A_TRANS_EURASIAN_ORIGINAL_LANGUAGE_AN_INTERDISCIPLINARY_APPROACH_LES_LANGUES_INDO_EUROPÉENNES_SONT_ELLES_ISSUES_DUNE_LANGUE_ORIGINELLE_TRANS_EURASIENNE_UNE_APPROCHE_INTERDISCIPLINAIRE)

5-

[https://www.academia.edu/77242303/Discussion the invalidity of Indo European Theory based on Mel Copelands studies Corresponding with Copeland](https://www.academia.edu/77242303/Discussion_the_invalidity_of_Indo_European_Theory_based_on_Mel_Copelands_studies_Corresponding_with_Copeland)

6-

[http://s155239215.onlinehome.us/turkic/40 Language/Toponymy/Droz dovTurkic-lingualPeriodOfEuropeanHistory1En.htm?fbclid=IwAR32UA2QRm2rUoDNNmlc0VuaeSBWu8n9-d93MiBvgKJ0IIGH6U1B9H95UAw](http://s155239215.onlinehome.us/turkic/40_Language/Toponymy/Droz dovTurkic-lingualPeriodOfEuropeanHistory1En.htm?fbclid=IwAR32UA2QRm2rUoDNNmlc0VuaeSBWu8n9-d93MiBvgKJ0IIGH6U1B9H95UAw)

7- Allan R. Bomhard, A Critical Review of Volumes 1 and 2 of ILLIČ-SVITYČ's Nostratic Dictionary, from academia.edu

8- Allan R. Bomhard, The Glottalic Theory of Proto-Indo-European Consonantism and Its Implication for Nostratic Sound Correspondences, Mother Tongue, 2007, academia.edu

9- Alexei Kassian, Mikhail Zhivlov and George Starostin; Proto-Indo-European-Uralic Comparison from the Probabilistic Point of View; from academia.edu

10-

https://www.academia.edu/73599227/Grammar_versus_Grammar_Structural_commonalities_of_Turkish_with_Indo_European_languages

11- Norm Kisamov, Turkic Substrate in English

<http://s155239215.onlinehome.us/turkic/41TurkicInEnglish/EnglishTurkicLexiconEn.htm>